<div align="center">

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

</div>

The non-final office action dated May 5, 2006, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-7 and 16-33 remain pending. Applicants have not amended the claims and merely provide a copy of the pending claims for the convenience of the Examiner.

Claims 1-3, 5-7, and 30-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(E) as being anticipated by Dorfman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,449,651, hereinafter referred to as *Dorfman*). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Applicants' independent claim 1 recites, among other features, "determining whether the management command was received at a management port coupled to the communication bus; and when the management command was received at the management port, executing the management command." The Action relies on various portions of *Dorfman* as allegedly describing these features. Specifically, the Action relies on column 5, ll. 25-35, ll. 45-50 and column 9, ll. 10-14. Neither the cited portions nor any other portion of *Dorfman* teaches or suggest these features of Applicants' claim 1.

Dorfman describes a system and method for providing temporary remote access to a computer. (Title and col. 1, ll. 8-10). The cited portions of *Dorfman* describe the use of a physical device, a dongle 40, to allow temporary access to a host computer 10. (Col. 5, ll. 25-43). Specifically, col. 5, ll. 43-50 of *Dorfman* recites:

> The dongle 40 includes a perishable password—i.e., the password becomes "ripe" at a certain time and will "expire" after a certain time—thus, if the dongle 40 is lost or stolen, the dongle 40 can only be used to access the host computer 10 within a small window of time. To provide an added layer of protection, the dongle 20 corresponding to the dongle 40 may be connected to the host computer 10.

As described, *Dorfman* describes a hardware device, only operational during a window time frame, to gain access to a host computer. *Dorfman* fails to teach or suggest anything with respect to a management port. Applicants' original written description describes a management port as "a predetermined port supported by a node for the benefit of the mode's local host, which port is deemed the only port authorized to receive management commands from devices coupled

to the communication bus." (Applicants' Original Written Description, p. 7, ll. 21-24). The cited portions of *Dorfman* describe how a remote computer 50 with a dongle 40 can gain access to a host computer 10 during a limited time window and fails to teach or suggest Applicants' claim 1 features, "determining whether the management command was received at a management port coupled to the communication bus; and when the management command was received at the management port, executing the management command." As such, because *Dorfman* fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of Applicants' claim 1, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-3 and 5-7, which depend from claim 1, are allowable over *Dorfman* for at least the same reasons as their ultimate base claim and further in view of the novel features recited therein. For example, Applicants' claim 3 recites, among other features, "when the management command was not received at the management port, ignoring the management command." Neither the cited portion nor any other portion of *Dorfman* teach or suggest this feature. Specifically, *Dorfman* describes that a dongle in a remote computer is deactivated if the remote computer attempts to access the host computer when the system date is outside of a predefined date range. (Col. 2, ll. 61-65). As such, under *Dorfman*, no signal is ignored as the physical hardware dongle 40 at the remote computer 50 is deactivated.

Applicants' independent claim 30 recites similar features to those described above with reference to Applicants' claim 1. As such, for at least similar reasons, Applicants' claim 30 is allowable over *Dorfman* and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. Claims 31-32, which depend from claim 30, are allowable over *Dorfman* for at least the same reasons as their ultimate base claim and further in view of the novel features recited therein.

Claims 4, 16-29, and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Dorfman* in view of Palm (U.S. Patent No. 6,873,652, hereinafter referred to as *Palm*). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 4 and 33 depend from Applicants' claims 1 and 30, respectively. *Palm* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Dorfman* described above with reference to claim 1 and 30. As such, for at least the same reasons as their ultimate base claims, Applicants' claims 4 and 33 are allowable over the combination of *Dorfman* and *Palm*.

Applicants' claim 16 recites, among other features, "an IEEE 1394 interface…comprising at least one port wherein the IEEE 1394 interface passes management commands received from a management port of the at least one port to the processor and ignores any management command received at any port of the at least one port other than the management port." The Action relies on Figure 2, reference elements 49 and 48 and column 5, ll. 60-67 of *Dorfman*. Neither the cited portions nor any other portion of *Dorfman* teaches or suggest these features of Applicants' claim 16.

The cited portion of *Dorfman* describes how an algorithm decrements an access counter stored in memory of a dongle 40 each time the dongle 40 is used to access a host computer 10. (Col. 5, ll. 60-67). As such, under *Dorfman*, any type of command from any port will operate unless the access counter is at zero remaining. Still further, any type of connector interface on dongle 40 of *Dorfman* fails to take into account whether management commands are received from a management port. The *Dorfman* interface 48 receives any signal and merely restricts access to a host computer 10 if the internal access counter is at zero. Palm fails to cure these deficiencies of *Dorfman*. As such, the combination of *Dorfman* and *Palm* fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of Applicants' claim 16. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 17-20, which depend from claim 16, are allowable over the combination of *Dorfman* and *Palm* for at least the same reasons as their ultimate base claim and further in view of the novel features recited therein.

Applicants' claim 21 recites, among other features, "a management command authorization component, in communication with the bus interface component, that determines whether each of the one or more management commands is authorized based on whether each of the one or more management commands was received at a management port coupled to the communication bus." As allegedly describing this feature, the Action relies on reference elements from Figure 2 and col. 5, lines 36-53 of *Dorfman*. The reference elements and cited portion of *Dorfman* describe how a remote computer 50, with a physical dongle 40, can gain access to a host computer 10, with a physical dongle 20, over communication lines 14 and 54.

However, *Dorfman* fails to teach or suggest management commands and whether a management command was received at a management port. If the internal access counter in dongle 40 is not at zero, any type of signal is received from or sent to host computer 10. *Dorfman* fails to determine anything with respect to a management port. Any determination by *Dorfman* is based on whether the internal counter is at zero. (See, *Dorfman* reference element 130 in Figure 4c and corresponding description, col. 8, ll. 5-9). As such, *Dorfman* fails to teach or suggest, "a management command authorization component, in communication with the bus interface component, that determines whether each of the one or more management commands is authorized based on whether each of the one or more management commands was received at a management port coupled to the communication bus." *Palm* fails to cure these deficiencies of *Dorfman*. As such, because the combination of *Dorfman* and *Palm* fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of Applicants' claim 21, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 22-29, which depend from claim 21, are allowable over the combination of *Dorfman* and *Palm* for at least the same reasons as their ultimate base claim and further in view of the novel features recited therein.

CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same. Should the Examiner find that a telephonic or personal interview would expedite passage to issue of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below. Applicants look forward to passage to issue of the present application at the earliest convenience of the Office.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: September 27, 2006   By: _____/John M. Fleming/_____

                                      John M. Fleming
1001 G Street, N.W.   Registration No. 56,536
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001